

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/755,541 01/12/2004		John B. Heywood	0492611-0534	1354	
24280 75	90 08/25/2005	EXAMINER			
CHOATE, HALL & STEWART LLP TWO INTERNATIONAL PLACE BOSTON, MA 02110			HARRIS, KATRINA B		
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
•			3747	3747	

DATE MAILED: 08/25/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary		Applicati	on No.	Applicant(s)			
		10/755,5	41	HEYWOOD ET AL.			
		Examine	T	Art Unit			
		Katrina B		3747			
The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address Period for Reply							
THE - Exte after - If the - If NC - Failt Any	ORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR I MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICAT nsions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communica e period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) day period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory are to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by reply received by the Office later than three months after the patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	TION. CFR 1.136(a). In no extition. s, a reply within the star period will apply and way statute, cause the apply statute.	rent, however, may a reply be tin tutory minimum of thirty (30) day rill expire SIX (6) MONTHS from olication to become ABANDONE	nely filed rs will be considered timely. the mailing date of this communication. D (35 U.S.C. § 133).			
Status							
1) 又	Responsive to communication(s) filed or	03 June 2005.					
	This action is FINAL . 2b)⊠ This action is non-final.						
3)□	Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.						
Disposit	ion of Claims						
5)□ 6)⊠ 7)⊠	4) Claim(s) 1-27 is/are pending in the application. 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration. 5) Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) Claim(s) 1-27 is/are rejected. 7) Claim(s) is/are objected to. 8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.						
Applicat	ion Papers						
9)[The specification is objected to by the Ex	aminer.					
10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.							
	Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).						
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to See 37 CFR 1.121(d). 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.							
Priority ι	ınder 35 U.S.C. § 119			•			
 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f). a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received. 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)). * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received. 							
Attachmen	t(s)						
1) 🔯 Notic	e of References Cited (PTO-892)		4) Interview Summary	(PTO-413)			
2) 🔲 Notic 3) 🔲 Infon	e of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-9 mation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/r No(s)/Mail Date		Paper No(s)/Mail Da				

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-14 and 25-27 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-10, 12-24, 26 and 27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over zur Loye et al. (6,684,849) in view of Cueman (6,866,016).

Zur Loye et al. discloses a high compression ration, homogeneous charge compression ignition/spark ignition dual mode engine comprising: a first mode employing homogeneous charge compression ignition at low and mid-load levels; and a second mode employing spark ignition at high load levels, the second mode including in the engine.

Cueman shows the addition of hydrogen or a hydrogen/carbon monoxide mixture.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to use the teachings of Cueman to add hydrogen in the invention of zur Loye et al. since zur Loye et al. teaches of the use of hydrogen as another fuel.

Regarding claim 15, reduces noise. (See column 14, lines 1-7)

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 11 and 25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over zur Loye et al. (6,684,849) in view of Daniel et al (2003/0047147). Zur Loye et al. discloses the claimed invention as stated above except the use of a plasmatron. Daniel et al. disclose the use of a plasmatron. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to add the plasmatron of Daniel et al into the invention of zur Loye et al. to improve the combustion of the system.

Communication

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Katrina B. Harris whose telephone number is 571-272-4842. The examiner can normally be reached on 6:30 AM -3:00 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Henry Yuen can be reached on 571-272-4856. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic

Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Katrina B. Harris

Examiner Art Unit 3747

KBH

Andrew M. Dolinar Primary Examiner